



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MIDDLE ENGLISH -W \bar{Q} -, -W \bar{O} -.

IN his "Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst," 1884, p. 23, my lamented teacher, Professor ten Brink, said :

"Schwanken zwischen \bar{q} und \bar{o} zeigen einige Wörter, deren aus AE. \bar{a} ¹ entstandenem Vokal ein *w* vorhergeht, bzw. ging : *wo*, *two*, *so* (desgl. natürlich *also*) aus *swā*, wahrscheinlich auch *who* aus *hwo* (AE. *hwā*). Das Adv. *tho* hat bei Chaucer \bar{q} (AE. $\beta\bar{a}$) und \bar{o} (nhd. *thō*) ; ob letztere Lautform auch in den Canterbury Tales vorkommt, lässt sich nicht streng erweisen. Weniger leicht erklärt es sich, wenn *go*, obgleich nicht in den Canterbury Tales, zuweilen im \bar{o} -Reim vorkommt."

Referring to the language of Bokenam's Legends ("Engl. Stud.," 1885, p. 223), A. Hoofe said :

"Ae. \bar{a} nach cons. + mitlautendem *u* findet sich im reim mit dem aus ae. \bar{o} entstandenen laut, der sicher ein ganz geschlossenes \bar{o} , wenn nicht schon der high vowel *u* war : *who* (ae. *hwā*) : *to* (ae. *tō*) 3/401. *two* (ae. *twā*) : *two* Pr. 125. *do* (ae. *dōn*) : *two* 8/982. *so* (ae. *swā*) : *do* : *to* 1/316. also : *doo* 3/294. . . . Wir dürfen demnach wohl annehmen, dass hier unter der einwirkung des vorher gehenden *w* schon früh me. der laut mit der fortsetzung von ae. \bar{o} zusammengefallen ist. Die reime mit diesen wörtern und ae. \bar{o} sind also ganz rein. Bei *also* und *so* ist im Ne. kein high vowel vorhanden. Dies erklärt sich dadurch, dass in *also* der ton, der bei Bok. noch auf dem zweiten bestandtheil ruht, später auf den ersten theil des compositums zurücktrat, und nun das -*so* in nicht vollbetonter silbe in der weiterbildung gehemmt war. Das einfache *so* hat sich nach dem zweiten theil von *also* gebildet, oder aber es war, weil proklitisch gebraucht, ebenfalls nicht vollbetont, und der vokal wurde dadurch an der entwicklung zum high vowel gehindert. Es steht

¹ I take the liberty of using in the quotations the same signs for quantity and for openness and closeness of vowel that are used in the rest of the article.

also nichts dem entgegen, für das me. *so* einen geschlossenen *o*-laut anzunehmen."

In his "History of English Sounds," 1888, Henry Sweet treats the matter as follows (§ 695):

"*q̄* after *w* became *ō* in lME. in most words, as in *twō*, *whō*, *wōmb*, as shown by the MnE. pronunciation. *wōd* 'woad' is an exception."

And in his "Second Middle English Primer" he marks these words with *ō*.

In 1890, having occasion to deal with the words, I came to the conclusion that both ten Brink and Sweet were mistaken, and I alluded to a part of the subject in my "Chaucer's Pronunciation," 1893, p. 21.

In 1891, Kluge ("Paul's Grundriss," I, p. 884) said:

"ME. *q̄* aus ae. *ā* nimmt nach *w* innerhalb der me. Zeit den geschlossenen *ō*-Laut an, der sich frühne zu *ū* entwickelt, in *whō* aus *whq̄* ae. *hwā*, in *twō* aus *twq̄* ae. *twā*, *swōpe* aus *swq̄pen* ae. *swāpan*; sowie in me. *wōmb* aus *wq̄mb* ae. *wāmb*; wohl auch in *wōwe* (ne. gespr. *wū*) für *wq̄wen*¹ (ae. *wōγian*) und in *wōrd* (16. Jahrh. *ū*) für me. ae. *wq̄rd*?¹ Vgl. ten Brink § 31. Doch ist im 16. Jahrh. noch die auf me. *q̄* deutende *ō*-Ausprache überliefert für *whom*, *woe*, *womb*, *woad*, Ellis, 909."

From the fact that in his later books ("A New English Grammar," 1892, § 804, and its two briefer forms) Sweet omits the statement as to the *-wō*-words in the section corresponding to the one quoted above, I infer that he has modi-

¹ I do not know why Kluge here assigns ME. 'wōwen' an open *q̄*; as for 'word,' Sweet is right in giving it, as well as 'bord,' 'ford,' 'hord,' a close *ō* in Middle English (cf. HES., § 692 and the markings in his 2d MEPr., 'bōrd,' Prolog 52, 'hōrd,' Truth 3, etc.). They all show *ū* in early Modern English (HES., p. 330); in 'bord,' 'ford,' and 'hord,' this *ū* was lowered to *ō* by the following *r* + voiced stop (as happened later before final *r* in the English of Virginia and other parts of our South and in that of London, especially in Cockney English: *yō(ur)*, *pō(or)*, etc., cf. Sweet's "Primer of Phonetics," § 200), and in the English of London and some other parts of the English-speaking world this *ō* itself has been lowered to *q̄* by the same agency, cf. also early MnE. *mūrn* > *mōrn* and in London, etc., *mq̄(r)n* 'mourn.' In 'word' the case was different: the preceding high-back *w* prevented the following *r* from lowering the *ū*, which, however, shortened after its cognate consonant *w* — thus, *wūrd*, which regularly became *wōrd* and later (in Southern England, our East and South, etc.) *wōd*.

fied or abandoned his old position, though I do not know that he has anywhere made a statement to that effect.

In an article on "Confusion between \bar{o} and $\bar{ö}$ in Chaucer's Rimes" ("Engl. Stud.," 1895, p. 341) and in his "The \bar{o} -vowel in English," 1895, p. 56, Professor Bowen's position is not clear. He speaks of *tw \bar{o}* , *sw \bar{o}* , *w \bar{o}* as forming a category in which *w* influenced the vowel, and in a foot-note ("Engl. Stud.," XX, p. 343) adds: "The English word *womb* has been drawn into the same category," and (in his book, p. 50) suggests that it "may have been influenced by the French word *tomb*." On the other hand he regards 'woe' as having departed from the category: "Perhaps the already existing word *woo* (A. S. *wōgian*) saved *wā* from experiencing a similar fate as *who*, in which event we should have had two words of like sounds, but of different meanings, which would necessarily lead to confusion." ("Engl. Stud.," XX, p. 342.)

Finally, Morsbach, in his "Mittelenglische Grammatik," 1896, p. 184, says:

"Während bei lax reimenden dichtern \bar{o} (= ae. \bar{a}) mit allen andern, kurzen und langen, offenen und geschlossenen *o* mehr oder weniger häufig im reim gebunden wird, findet sich bei streng reimenden dichtern allenthalben das aus ae. \bar{a} hervorgegangene \bar{o} [\bar{a}^o] überwiegend im selbstreim. Nur wo dem \bar{o} ein *w* unmittelbar vorausgeht (welches später schwindet), hat sich im verlauf des 13. jahrh. vielfach ein geschlossener laut entwickelt, welcher teils durch reime mit [\bar{o}], teils durch das ne. als [\bar{o}]-laut erwiesen wird. Dies ist allenthalben der fall bei *s(w) \bar{o}* , *als(w) \bar{o}* , *t(w) \bar{o}* ; doch haben *s(w) \bar{o}* , *als(w) \bar{o}* doppelte aussprache, geschlossene und offene, gehabt, je nachdem das betr. wörtchen in satzbetonter oder satztieftoniger stellung sich befand. Die ne. aussprache [$\bar{o}u$] beruht auf offenem me. laut im satztiefton. Geht dem *w* kein anderer konsonant voraus, so scheint der offene laut erhalten zu sein, da wörter wie *wōt* (ae. *wāt*), *wō* (ae. *wā*), *wōd* (ae. *wād*), *wōn* (an. *vān*) bei den sorgfältigsten dichtern nicht mit [\bar{o}] reimen. Einzelne ausnahmen sind nach den unten unter 3) angeführten fällen zu beurteilen; vgl. auch die ne. aussprache mit [$\bar{o}u$]. Stephen Hawes reimt *so*, *also* und *wo* (ae. *wā*) nur mit offenem \bar{o} ; vgl. Fuhr 34. Auch das pron. *wō*, *whō* (ae. *hwā*), das im reim kaum belegt ist, hat demnach den [\bar{a}^o]-laut; anders me. *h(w) \bar{o}* [\bar{o}] = ne. *who* [$hū$]."

It is clear not only that the statements of these various writers are more or less at variance with one another, but also that no one of them satisfactorily accounts for all the phenomena in the case, though Morsbach most nearly does so. We have three chief facts to consider: (1) That these words often rime with \bar{e} ; (2) That some of them often rime with \bar{o} ; (3) That some of them have \bar{o} in Modern English and others \bar{u} . It is the object of this paper to show that these phenomena are all in harmony with one another.

I.

Chaucer's Usage.

Let us enter upon the consideration of the problem from the point of view held by ten Brink, namely, the rimes in Chaucer. He assumed that when *so*, *two*, etc., rime with *dō*, *tō*, etc., the rime is pure, that is, that *so* and *two* have \bar{o} . If this were true, we should expect to find that even in the poet's best writings these rimes were frequent, while the riming of *tō*, *dō*, etc., with *gē* and other words whose \bar{e} is unquestioned was much rarer. It will not be difficult to show that this is not the case.

In a paper¹ that I read at the meeting of the Modern Language Association at New Haven last winter I made it clear, among other things, that Chaucer's works reveal the fact that in the course of his literary career he improved decidedly in rime technique, the two extremes being marked by *The Book of the Duchesse* and *Troilus and Criseyde*. It is, therefore, evident that it would be folly to base inferences as to Chaucer's language upon the rimes of *The Book of the Duchesse*, etc., if the rimes of the *Troilus and Criseyde* would contradict them; in fact, it will hereafter be our duty in handling questions of this sort to use the *Troilus and Criseyde* in preference to the rest of Chaucer's works, unless it be some of the *Canterbury Tales*. My present statistics are,

¹ I am forced to postpone for a time the publication of this study because I lack the time to complete it. Cf., however, *Modern Language Notes*, 1896, Feb., p. 39.

therefore, drawn from the final \bar{o} - \bar{q} rimes in *Troilus and Criseyde*. The rimes of the *Canterbury Tales* taken as a whole would prove my position with slightly less positiveness.

The words involved are: (1) *two*, *hwo*, *s(w)o*, and *swopen*, in which the *w* is crowded onto the vowel by a preceding consonant; (2) *wo*, *wod*, *wot*, *wost*, and *womb*, in which the *w* is initial. The first word needing consideration is *so*. The fact that this word had early lost its *w* in consequence of its usually occurring in weak positions leaves it at least an open question whether the *w* had an opportunity to affect the vowel. In the *Troilus and Criseyde*, 'so' rimes with —

$$\begin{array}{ll} d\bar{o} \text{ 1, } t\bar{o} \text{ 1, } = & \bar{o} \text{ 2,} \\ als\bar{q} \text{ 1, } tw\bar{q} \text{ 11, } w\bar{q} \text{ 14, } = & (w)\bar{q} \text{ 26,} \\ f\bar{q} \text{ 4, } fr\bar{q} \text{ 3, } ag\bar{q} \text{ 2, } g\bar{q} \text{ 23, } h\bar{q} \text{ 1, } j\bar{q} \text{ 1,} \\ m\bar{q} \text{ 11, } n\bar{q} \text{ 3, } th\bar{q} \text{ 7, } = & \bar{q} \text{ 55.} \end{array}$$

That is, it rimes with original \bar{o} but twice, 26 times with words having lost or retained *w* before the \bar{q} , and 55 times, or more than twice as often, with words whose \bar{q} is unquestioned. With $g\bar{q}$ alone it rimes about as many times as with all the $(w)\bar{q}$ cases combined. That Chaucer's 'so' was anything else than $s\bar{q}$ is, thus, simply out of the question, and I shall hereafter treat it as $s\bar{q}$. It should be added that Sweet — differing here from ten Brink — recognizes this and prints the word with \bar{q} in his "Second Middle English Primer." That this accords perfectly with the regular development of OE. $\bar{a} > \text{ME. } \bar{q} > \text{MnE. } \bar{o}$, need hardly be mentioned.

Of the remaining words, *two* and *wo* alone occur in rime in T. & C.; 'wo' rimes with —

$$\begin{array}{ll} d\bar{o} \text{ 1, } t\bar{o} \text{ 1, } = & \bar{o} \text{ 2,} \\ tw\bar{q} \text{ 9, } = & -w\bar{q} \text{ 9,} \\ f\bar{q} \text{ 1, } fr\bar{q} \text{ 2, } ag\bar{q} \text{ 2, } g\bar{q} \text{ 9, } h\bar{q} \text{ 1, } m\bar{q} \text{ 5,} \\ n\bar{q} \text{ 2, } als\bar{q} \text{ 1, } s\bar{q} \text{ 12, } th\bar{q} \text{ 6, } = & \bar{q} \text{ 41.} \end{array}$$

That is, it too rimes with original \bar{o} but twice, with another $-w\bar{q}$ -word 9 times, and with undoubted \bar{q} 41 times. It rimes with another $-w\bar{q}$ -word no oftener than it does with $g\bar{q}$, and not nearly so often as it does with $s\bar{q}$. No unbiassed mind

would, under the circumstances, suspect 'wo' of having \bar{o} rather than, or along side of, \bar{q} , even if *two* had \bar{o} , which we shall show it did not have. And when we consider that *wo* accords as perfectly with the normal development of OE. \bar{a} as any word in the language, it seems strange that it should be necessary to prove that it had \bar{q} in the standard language in ME. times :

OE.	<i>stān</i>	<i>dā</i>	<i>wā</i>
ME.	<i>st\bar{q}n</i>	<i>d\bar{q}</i>	<i>w\bar{q}</i>
MnE.	<i>stōn(e)</i>	<i>d\bar{o}(e)</i>	<i>w\bar{o}(e)</i>

To come now to *two*, whose MnE. \bar{u} (or *uw*) is largely responsible for this whole discussion, we find that it rimes with —

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{o} \text{ 1, } t\bar{o} \text{ 1, } &= & \bar{o} \text{ 2,} \\ f\bar{q} \text{ 1, } fr\bar{q} \text{ 2, } ag\bar{q} \text{ 1, } g\bar{q} \text{ 9, } m\bar{q} \text{ 4, } n\bar{q} \text{ 1,} \\ als\bar{q} \text{ 2, } s\bar{q} \text{ 8, } w\bar{q} \text{ 9, } &= & \bar{q} \text{ 37.} \end{aligned}$$

That is, it rimes with \bar{o} twice and with \bar{q} 37 times. As the strophes demand sometimes a rime of two words and sometimes one of three, it is interesting to consider the rime-groups as well as the individual rimes. We then find that 'two' occurs in 24 rime-groups and in only one of them does it rime with \bar{o} , namely: *tw \bar{q} : d \bar{o} : t \bar{o}* , Bk. II, St. 24. That this is no oftener than other words with \bar{q} rime with \bar{o} may be seen from the following table :

In 24 chances	<i>tw\bar{q}</i>	rimes with \bar{o}	1 time = $\frac{1}{24}$,
" 42	" (a) <i>g\bar{q}</i>	" " "	2 times = $\frac{1}{12}$,
" 16	" <i>th\bar{q}</i>	" " "	1 time = $\frac{1}{16}$,
" 31	" <i>w\bar{q}</i>	" " "	2 times = $\frac{1}{15}$,
" 45	" <i>s\bar{q}</i>	" " "	4 times = $\frac{1}{11}$.

Oddly enough, *tw \bar{q}* happens to rime with \bar{o} less often than the other words do. In the whole poem there are but 5 (or at most 6) other cases of the impure rime final - \bar{q} : - \bar{o} —

Bk. I	stanza	11,	<i>Appollo : d\bar{o} : g\bar{q},</i>
" "	"	78,	<i>t\bar{o} : w\bar{q},</i>
" "	"	119,	<i>d\bar{o} : w\bar{q} : s\bar{q},</i>
" II	"	4,	<i>th\bar{q} : s\bar{q} : d\bar{o},</i>
" "	"	114,	<i>d\bar{o} : ag\bar{q} : s\bar{q}.</i>

From here on the poet absolutely avoids such a rime, for the one in Bk. IV, 154 (*tō:sq̄*), should not be counted.¹ It will be noticed that the rime *twq̄:dō:tō* occurs along with the other impure rimes and without question is to be explained in no other way than they.

Morsbach doubts the occurrence of *who* in rime in Middle English; I find it riming with *q̄* in —

The Reeves Tale, 380, A., 4300,	<i>whq̄:twq̄</i> ,
The W. of B. Prolog, D., 692,	<i>whq̄:mq̄</i> ,
Gower's C. A. VII, 8,	<i>whq̄:fq̄</i> ,
“ “ “ VIII, 3,	<i>whq̄:þq̄</i> ,
“Chaucer's Dream,” 1307,	<i>whq̄:gq̄</i> .

But I have not been able to find a single case of its riming with *ō* in any southern (see p. 22) poem.

I have no note of the occurrence of *wq̄t* or *wq̄st* in rime in T. & C. It happens, however, to occur in rime in the *Canterbury Tales* 13 times and invariably rimes with words having *q̄*.

wod, being a technical word, does not occur in rime in T. & C. or the C. T., or anywhere in Chaucer, so far as I know. There is, however, no difficulty about the word, for its development is perfectly normal:

OE.	<i>gād</i>	<i>wād</i>
ME.	<i>gq̄d</i>	<i>wq̄d</i>
MnE.	<i>gō(a)d</i>	<i>wō(a)d</i>

I do not know that *womb* appears in rime in Chaucer. I find it, however, riming with *q̄* in other ME. texts:

wq̄mbe:lq̄mbe, Robt. of Gl., p. 280 and 369. Reprint of Herne, 1810.

wq̄mbe:hq̄nde, Signa ante Judicium, 37, Anglia III, 534.

wq̄mbe:brq̄nde, Arthur and Merlin, younger version, 1120, p. 345.

wq̄mbe:hq̄me, Barclay's "Ship of Fools," Edinburgh ed., 1874, p. 178.

¹ It occurs in the passage, from Boetius, on predestination and free-will, which I showed, in the paper above referred to, to be inferior in the technique of rime and verse to the rest of the poem, and so, doubtless, of earlier workmanship. When Chaucer was occupied in rendering the "Boetius" into English, he probably tried his hand at putting some portions of it into verse, and later inserted this in the *Troilus and Criseyde*.

And as the word is given an *o* by Salisbury (who had an *u* in *do* and *to*) as late as 1547 (Ellis, E. E. P. III, p. 909), there can be no question that it had *ġ* in Chaucer's pronunciation.

In short, not only have we no evidence that *w* had changed a following *ġ* to *ō* in Chaucer's pronunciation, but all the evidence that we possess goes to prove that his *ġ* was unaffected by a preceding *w*.

All this is so evident that it seems useless to say more about it; still, I cannot refrain from suggesting to the lover of Chaucer that he run through a marked text, like that in Sweet's "Second ME. Primer," and change the *ō* of *two* to *ġ* where it occurs in rime, for example, in the "Pardoner's Tale":

atwō : mġ 31,
twō : sġ 168,
alsġ : twō 241,
twō : alsġ 247.

If he is a true lover of the poet, he will, I am sure, join me in a feeling of satisfaction at having relieved his author of an undeserved reproach.

II.

A New Rime-Test.

The question now arises: To what extent was Chaucer's usage representative of ME. usage generally? As stated above (p. 14), Hoofe ("Engl. Stud.," 1885, VIII, 223) has shown that in the Suffolk dialect of 1443, as reproduced in Bokenam's *Legends*, *two*, *who*, *so*, and *also* rime with *dō* and *tō* and not with *gġ*, *fġ*, *frġ*, etc.; and Pabst ("Die Sprache . . . des Robert von Gloucester," diss., Berlin, 1889, § 4) refers to a similar state of things in the West. These facts led me to suspect that the general Midland usage in this matter might be different from that of the South (including London). In order to determine this, I took those ME. texts whose geographical position is fairly well known, and,

selecting such as maintain well the distinction between *dō*, *tō*, etc., and *gȳ*, *fȳ*, etc., I examined them to see whether the *-(w)o-* words rimed with *dō*, *tō*, etc., or with *gȳ*, *fȳ*, etc. My anticipation was fully substantiated. Those texts that were known to be of Midland origin showed *ō* in *two*, *who*, and *so*, while the Southern texts showed *ȳ*. For example, in the South we have with *twȳ*, *whȳ*, and *sȳ*: Chaucer, Gower, Arthur and Merlin, Octavian (A), Launfal, Libeaus Desconus, The Owl and the Nightingale, and later, Skelton, Drayton, etc. In the Midland we have with *twō*, *whō*, *sō*: (West) Robert of Gloucester, the Legends in Ms. Laud., 108, Bodl. (EETS., 1887), St. Quiriac (Vernon Ms.), Finding of the Cross (Ashm. Ms., 43, Bodl., etc.), (north-east) Havelok the Dane, (southern Lincolnshire) Robert Manning, (Norfolk) Capgrave's St. Katherine, (Suffolk) Bokenam's Legends, and later, Bale, (Cambridgeshire) Lydgate,¹ (southern East Midland) Genesis and Exodus, etc. Lack of time and of available texts prevents my determining this *-wō-* belt with exactness. At present it appears that the territory agrees pretty closely with what is generally denominated the Midland, but its southern boundary is more nearly parallel with the southern coast of England and so includes Gloucestershire and excludes London and other territory usually counted as East Midland or as borderland of the Midland and the South. It should also be observed that a number of texts that are now called Midland texts also show *ȳ* in the words in question, but they are invariably such texts as are in the northern borderland and about which there is more or less strife as to whether to put them on one side of the border or on the other. This applies to Athelstan, A Dispute between the Body and the Sowle, Amis and Amiloun, Horn Child and Maiden Rimnild, The Paraphrase of the Seven Penitential Psalms, Sir Cleges, Octavian (B), etc. The far Northern texts show, of course, *ā*, and I do not know to what extent the southerly Northern texts with *ȳ* represent a real *ȳ* or only a Southern spelling for *ā*. In some cases, for example, "A Dispute between

¹ Lydgate is careless in his rimes, but a close study of them shows that he had *twō*, *whō*, *sō*.

the Body and the Sowle," we may have a true Midland text that is younger than the *Ormulum* and so has $\bar{q} < \bar{a}$, but is older than the change from *-wġ-* to *-wō-*, which may have taken place half a century later in the East than in the West.

As is well known, most of the criteria of Midland dialect are of a negative character, that is, they consist in the lack of distinct Northern and Southern peculiarities. The *-wġ-wō-*rime-test, on the contrary, now furnishes us with a positive criterion. When the extent of the *-wō-*territory has been more exactly determined, the chief use that will be made of the new rime-test will, of course, be the determination of the location of poems whose geographical position is still unsettled. But it will also aid in determining questions of authorship. No poem with numerous final-*o* rimes that was written by Chaucer, Occleve, or Lydgate, could now be ascribed to one of the other two. For Chaucer has *twġ*, *whġ*, *sġ*, and Lydgate has *twō*, *whō*, *sō*, while, as I shall show in the next section of this paper, Occleve has *twō* but *whġ* and *sġ*. Tempting as these studies are, other engagements will prevent my prosecuting them, and I shall hail with pleasure whatever use my fellow-workers in English may make of the new rime-test.

I shall myself mention but one such case, which happened to come under my eye. The *Legends* edited by Horstmann for the EETS., 1887, are written almost entirely in a Western *-wō-*dialect, some of the legends being by a writer (or writers) very fond of final-*o* rimes, and some by a writer (or writers) quite sparing in their use. That these writers have incorporated certain writings of others is not unknown, so especially the *Magdalene legend* (*66). The final-*o* rimes in this are remarkable for their impurity, and stand in striking contrast to those of the neighboring legends. I do not, however, know that it has been observed that of the *Legend of St. Beket* the first 202 lines, treating of the parentage of Beket, are by a different hand from the rest of the legend. The writer rimes *-wo* with \bar{q} , and is not very careful with his rimes.

III.

The History of the Influence of *w* on a following \bar{q} .

It remains for me to trace the history of the influence of *w* on a following \bar{q} . It is evident that the *w*-modification began very early in the Midland and that it took place only when the *w* was crowded by an initial consonant, hence in *two*, *hwo*, *swo*, and doubtless *swopen*; for example, in Boke-nam's Legends —

<i>twō</i> : <i>ther̄tō</i> ,	p. 4, 125,
<i>dō</i> : <i>tō</i> : <i>whō</i> ,	p. 64, 399,
<i>tō</i> : <i>whō</i> ,	p. 64, 403,
<i>alsō</i> : <i>ontō</i> ,	p. 151, 1004,
<i>sō</i> : <i>dō</i> ,	p. 113, 444.

But in the earliest texts that I have observed, the *w* had already become silent in *swō* because the word usually occurred in weak positions (cf. MnE. *answer*, etc.). Hence we have early in the thirteenth century (for example, in "Genesis" and "Exodus") for Midland forms *twō*, *whō*, *sō*. These thus joined *dō* and *tō* and, under like conditions, developed as they did. In stressed positions we should expect in early Modern English : *t(w)ū*, *(w)hū*, *sū*, *dū*, and *tū*. The earliest record we possess of MnE. pronunciation happens to be that furnished by the Welsh orthography of a Hymn to the Virgin (Phil. Soc. Trans., 1880-81, *35), of about 1500, followed half a century later by the dictionary and pamphlet of the Welshman, Salisbury. These give us *tū*, *hū*, *sō*, *dū*, *tū*. The forms *sō* and *tū* (= 'to') are due to the frequent occurrence of the words in the weak position. When the normal stressed form had *ō*, the weak form had *ō*; it is evident that at this stage of the development of Midland English the weak form of 'so' prevailed, and thus the strong form **sū* does not appear, but in its place the lengthened weak form, hence *sō*.¹ In the case of 'to' the stressed form *tō* regularly

¹ In just the same way the old strong form of 'you,' riming with 'thou,' for example, in Heywood's works (1562) and still allowed by Cooper (1685), began to yield to the weak form *jū* early in the sixteenth century (Skelton, about 1500,

became *tū* (the form in the Hymn to the Virgin), whose weak counterpart *tū* is the form given by Salisbury.¹ In his notes on the Hymn to the Virgin (Phil. Soc. Trans., 1880-81, *35), Ellis calls attention to the fact that the English of these Welshmen must have been that of the adjacent English territory; but this, as we have seen, was *-wō-*territory. We need, therefore, no longer be surprised to find *tū* for 'two' and *hū* for 'who' only a hundred years after Chaucer said *twġ* and *whġ*; for these Western forms, *tū* and *hū*, are descended, not from the London *twġ* and *whġ* of a little before 1400, but from the West Midland *twō* and *whō* of 1250 or earlier.

Turning now to the English of London, we found that all the words in question still had *ġ* in Chaucer's speech. That is, in the South the *w* had not begun to affect the following *ġ* for some 200 years after it had done so in the Midland. But the *w* in 'swo' had, so far as we can judge, fallen out in the South about the same time that it had in the Midland, and, thus, there was no *w* in this word at the time that *w* in 'two' began to affect the following vowel in the South. We, therefore, do not expect ME. *sġ* to develop otherwise than *gġ*, etc., did, and we find it does not. In the case of *twġ* we naturally expect a rising of the *ġ* to *ō* before other *ġ*'s (that is, those that were not preceded by a consonant + *w*) rose to *ō*. And this we find in the speech of Chaucer's pupil and immediate successor Occleve, who regularly rimes 'two' with *dō* and *tō*, but continues to rime *sġ* and *whġ* with *gġ*, *fġ*, *frġ*, etc. We may thus date the change of *twġ* > *twō* in standard English at about 1400. From that time on, we find it riming with 'do,' 'to,' 'sho(e),' etc. In just the same

rimed 'you' with 'Jew' as well as with 'now'), and this weak *jū* when stressed became *jū*, oddly enough the very sound the strong form had in Middle English (Sweet, "New English Grammar," § 1080).

¹ We still have similar diversity in Modern English: generally the strong form *tō* prevailed and became *tū*, and we now say *tū* in stressed positions and *tū* or *tō* in weak positions; but in some parts of England (for example, Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Lancaster, etc.) and America (for example, Georgia, Florida, etc.), one may still hear *tō* as the strong form and *tō* as the weak. Indeed, Kluge (P's. Gr., I, p. 885, 3) has called attention to the fact that the weak position is responsible for OE. *tō* rather than **tū*, cf. *cū* 'cow' < *kō*, etc.

way, OE. *swāpan*, ME. *swōpen* > *swōpe(n)* > *swūp*, though the word happens to be rare in literature.¹

But we have long to wait before we find 'who' riming with 'do,' 'to,' etc. In the so-called "Chaucer's Dream" it rimes with 'go,' 1307. Skelton, about 1500 (Dyce ed., 1843, p. 51), rimes it with *placebo*, but he always rimes final Latin -o with 'go,' 'fro,' etc., never with 'do,' 'to,' etc. In 1568 Smith gives 'whom' *o* not *u*. And in "Gammer Gurton's Needle," 1575, we find the rime *home:whom* twice (D. & H., III, 3, 219 and IV, 2, 232). In 1580 Bullokar gives 'who' as *whū*, and in 1594 Kid (Cornelia, D. & H., V, 235) rimes 'whom' with 'come,' that is, *ū* with *ǔ*. In 1613, Drayton in his *Poly-Olbion* rimes 'who' with *ō* twice ('show,' 22, p. 58; 'so,' 27, p. 135. Spenser Society's ed.) and with *ū* once ('doe' = 'do,' 22, p. 60). Gill in 1621 gives 'who' as *whū* and 'whose' as *whūz*, and recognizes both *ō* and *ū* for 'whom.' Cooper in 1685 and Jones in 1701 give *hūm*.

Parallel with the change of *whō* and *whōm* to *whū* and *whūm* was the change going on in 'womb.' In Middle English and early Modern English the word rimes with words having *ǔ*, which gradually changes to *ō* (Sweet, HES., 839-40).

wombe: lombe, about 1300, Robt. of Gl., p. 280 and 369. Reprint of Herne, 1810.

wombe: bronde, Arthur and Merlin (younger), p. 345, 1120.

wombe: honde, *Signa ante Judicium*, Anglia III, p. 534, 37.

wombe: home, 1509, Barclay's *Ship of Fools*, Edin. ed., 1874, p. 178.

The first indication of *u* is in the rimes —

womb: thumb, 1537, Thersites, D. & H., I, 416.

wombe: tomb, 1557, Collier's *Tottle's Misc.*, p. 221 and 230.

Smith in 1568 still gives *o*, but we continue to find *u*-rimes:

womb: doom, 1575, Appius and Claudius, D. & H., IV, 115.

wombe: dombe, come, become, about 1594, Constable, London ed., 1859, p. 54.

wombe: tomb, 1595, Barnfield, Arber ed., 1882, p. 79.

¹ Sweet derives 'sweep' from ME. *swōpen* (HES., p. 341) instead of *swēpen*; Skeat has it correctly.

And in 1663 Butler gives the word as *wūm*, as does Cooper in 1685, Buchanan in 1766, etc., down. A late straggler is Dyche who in 1710 still gives the word as *wōm*.

When we consider that 'two' parted company with the *ǣ*-words by 1400, while 'who' did not do so until 200 years later, it is absurd to consider the cases as parallel, that is, to suppose that the change was in both words due to *w* preceded by another consonant (as, on the other hand, it certainly was when Midland *twǣ*, *hwǣ*, *swǣ* > *twō*, *hwō*, *s(w)ō*). In fact, we know that the *hw* or *w/h* had long ceased to be *h* + *w* and had become voiceless *w* (Sweet, HES., § 725, 973). We should, therefore, under like conditions, no more expect the vowel in 'who' to be affected by the initial voiceless *w* than that the vowel in 'wo' should be similarly affected, which it surely was not. When we observe, however, that the change of *ō* to *ū* takes place in 'who,' 'whom' about the same time that it does in 'womb,' we naturally look for a similar cause. This I find in the *m* of 'womb'¹ and 'whom.' The initial *w* and *w/h* require, of course, both the lip and the tongue position of *u* while the following *m* makes it necessary to completely close the lips immediately after sounding the *o*. Under these circumstances it would be almost impossible to maintain the *o*-position of the lips between these two more rounded positions. There was thus developed an *ō* with the rounding of *ū*, which was, naturally, heard as *ū* and so reproduced and handed down. How great an influence the following *m* must have had upon *ō* may be seen from the fact that, aided by the *u*-like tongue position of *c*, it succeeded to some extent in raising the *ō* of 'comb' to *ū*; thus, in 1701 Jones gives 'comb' as *kūm*, as does also "The Expert Orthoepist" in 1704 (cf. Sweet's HES., p. 291), and in his "Grammatica Anglicana," 2d ed. 1736, Arnold gives both *kōm* and *kūm* (Löwisch, "Zur Englischen Aussprache," 1889, p. 64).

That 'who' and 'whose' may have been, to some extent, affected by 'whom' is not impossible; still, there are some

¹ This explanation was suggested to me as to 'womb' by Prof. O. F. Emerson, and accords with Sweet's explanation of the retention of *ū* in 'room,' 'stoop,' 'droop,' HES., § 829.

reasons for doubting it. Of the three forms, 'whom' is the rarest, at Shakespear's time not over 18 %.¹ Moreover, as may be seen from the citations above, the change appears to have taken place in 'who' and 'whose' earlier than in 'whom,' at least to have become established in them sooner. This suggests a difference in the use of 'who' and 'whose' on the one hand and of 'whom' on the other. An examination of Shakespear's usage reveals the fact that, at the time in question, 'whom' occurred in weak positions about 40 times in a hundred and was stressed 60 times; while 'who' as an interrogative is weak 60 %, and as a relative 80 %, and 'whose,' both as relative and as interrogative, is weak 90 %. Moreover, 'who' and especially 'whose' usually occur in the very weakest position, that is, just before a heavily stressed word. Under such conditions it is not easy, in a language having strong stress-accent, to modify the tongue- and lip-positions (assumed for the initial sounds of the weak word) in such a way as to correctly articulate the final sounds: they are, therefore, apt to shorten, to assimilate partially to the preceding sounds, or to entirely disappear. The vowel in the weak forms in question regularly became short, that is, short high *o* (cf. the similar *o* in German 'so schön,' 'sogleich,' etc.). Being short, the vowel was still more exposed to the influence of the high-back *wh* and was thus raised to the *u*-position. When the word was stressed, the vowel of the weak form was lengthened: *(w)hū*, — just as weak 'you' *jū* became strong *jū* (cf. footnote, p. 24, above); but the weak *hū* is still the more common form.

In these varied ways it came about that by 1600 Southern 'two,' 'who,' 'so,' and 'swoop,' had caught up with their Midland cousins; and, thus, the diversity of usage that it was one of the objects of this paper to present had come to an end.

The other words involved in this question, namely, 'woe,' 'woad,' and 'wot,' have passed on regularly to *ō*. In 'wot,' however, as in 'hot,' the *o* became short before the *t* because

¹ These and the following statistics as to the use of *who*, *whose*, and *whom*, I owe to the members of my class in the History of the English Language, who have collected them from thirty of his plays.

it always stood in a closed syllable, as I have shown elsewhere.¹ The word regularly rimes with \bar{q} in Middle English, for example,

w \bar{q} st: *g \bar{q} st*, Owl and Nightingale, XI, 48, Percy Society.

w \bar{q} st: *g \bar{q} st*: *m \bar{q} st*: *b \bar{q} st*, St. Bernard's Lamentation on Christ's Passion, 37, p. 299.

w \bar{q} te: *sm \bar{q} te*, Gower's C. A., II, 189.

w \bar{q} te: *h \bar{q} te*, id., II, 225.

w \bar{q} t: *h \bar{q} t*, id., III, 297.

and as stated above, 13 times in the *Canterbury Tales*. The shortening in 'wot' and 'hot' seems to have begun about 1550, for from this time on we find them riming with 'not,' 'got,' etc.

God wot: *not*, 1557, Jacob and Esau, D. & H., II, p. 204, 260.

wot: *pot*, id., p. 223.

hot: *pot*, id., p. 218.

note: *not*, Tottle's Misc., Collier's ed., p. 190.

God wot: *not*, Wyatt, id., p. 103.

God wot: *got*, Grimald, id., p. 142.

God wot: *got*: *lot*, Churchyarde's Chippes, Collier's ed., p. 24, 59.

To sum up, *w* affected a following ME. \bar{q} , MnE. \bar{o} :

I. In the Midland at a very early period, but only when crowded onto the vowel by an initial consonant: *tw \bar{q}* , *hw \bar{q}* , *sw \bar{q}* , and *sw \bar{q} pen*; in these the \bar{q} was thereby changed to \bar{o} , and thenceforward shared the lot of other \bar{o} 's;

II. In the South —

1) About 1400, under the same conditions as in the Midland; but by this time only *tw \bar{q}* and *sw \bar{q} pen* belonged to the category and suffered change of \bar{q} to \bar{o} ;

2) When all \bar{q} 's had become \bar{o} by free change, -w \bar{o} - > -w \bar{u} - between 1550 and 1600:

(a) Before the labial *m*: 'womb,' 'whom';

(b) In words that usually occur in the weak position (through \bar{o} > \bar{u}): 'who,' 'whose.'

In 'who,' 'whose,' 'whom' and in 'two,' the consonant *w* disappeared in the vowel *u*, as it did in other words. In

¹ Michigan University Record, April, 1891.

'who,' etc., and in 'whoop' and its derivatives, the difference between the voiceless *wh* and the *ū* was more noticeable than the similarity was, and this led to the neglect of the lip-rounding of the *wh*, which thus became an *h* with more or less of the tongue position of the following vowel, as usual with initial *h*. In '(w)ooze' the case is different: words of this type (cf. 'woo,' 'womb,' 'wound') require the *w* after a vowel but not after a consonant (cf. Brugmann I, § 117, 153). Most of them frequently occur after a vowel: the nouns after 'the,' 'a,' 'any,' 'every,' etc.; the verbs after 'he,' 'she,' 'we,' 'you,' 'they,' etc., and the *w* is thus maintained. But the verb '(w)ooze,' because of its peculiar meaning, rarely occurs except after 'it,' 'is,' 'was,' 'has,' 'will,' etc., or nouns like 'blood,' 'juice,' etc., for example, 'it's oozing out,' 'it oozed out,' etc. In this way the *w* disappeared; and in just the same way it disappeared in 'two,' *t(w)ū*, cf. the same loss in primitive Germanic, Brugmann I, p. 160, and in Latin *equos* > *ecūs* > *ecus*, etc., Brugmann I. § 172, 2; see also § 157. On the other hand, the only word I know of that in early Modern English began with *ū*, namely 'oof,' occurred so frequently after another vowel — 'the oof' — that an hiatus *w* was developed, and the word became 'woof.' The associated words 'warp' and 'weave' may have aided this, but it is significant that they were powerless until the ME. *ō* had become MnE. *ū*.

GEORGE HEMPL.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
ANN ARBOR.

I see that Sievers has just (PB. XXII, 255) discovered a *w*-test for Old English, namely Midland (and Kentish) *weoruld*: Saxon and Northern *woruld*. Though his position needs no strengthening, it may not be amiss to add to his citations for late West Saxon: *Blickling Homilies* with 66 *worold*: 2 *weorold* (*weoroldlice* 199, 36 is manifestly a slip for *weorðlice*); and *Byrhtferð's Handbok* with 11 *worold*: no *weorold*. That Sievers is right in assigning the four *eo*-forms in H. Ms. *Cur. Past.* to the copyist is made the more likely by the fact that the H. Ms.'s *nan oðer god ðisse weorolde* evidently contains an addition as over against the C. Ms.'s, *nan oðer god*; and that two of the remaining *eo*-forms adjoin other *eo*-words and so are, in all probability, mere slips: *ðonne ðeos weorold* 31/22, *ðisse weorlde freond* 421/34. Similarly, of the two exceptions in the *Blickling Homilies*, one is *ondweardan weorld* 35/31. I suppose Sievers' "Die Chronik aber hat nur *wo*" is a slip for "Orosius," etc.; Plummer cites only one case in the Parker Ms.: *worulde*, p. 118. — G. H.